

An. Code. 1924, sec. 127. 1912, sec. 122. 1904, sec. 121. 1888, sec. 122.
1798, ch. 101, sub-ch. 11, sec. 3. 1898, ch. 331. 1933, ch. 386.

127. If there be a surviving husband or a widow, as the case may be, and no child or descendant of the intestate, but the said intestate shall leave a father or mother, the surviving husband or widow, as the case may be, shall have one-half. If there be a surviving husband or widow, as the case may be, and no child or descendant of the intestate, and no parent, but the said intestate shall leave a brother or sister, or child of descendant of a brother or sister, the surviving husband or widow, as the case may be, shall take Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000.00) or its equivalent in property, or any interest therein, at its appraised value, and one-half of the residue.

Neither a murderer nor his heirs or representatives through him can inherit or take any portion of the estate of the one murdered. *Price v. Hittaffer*, 164 Md. 505.

To last note to this section, page 2914, vol. 2 of Code, add *Levin v. Safe Dep. & Tr. Co.*, 167 Md. 43.

132.

This section applied in *Woodworth v. Tepper*, 152 Md. 333 (involving unpaid instalments of war veterans' insurance).

134.

To first note to this section, page 2916, vol. 2, of Code, add "(decided prior to act 1916, ch. 224)".

135.

Collateral relations are to be ascertained by civil law method of beginning count with decedent and counting up to common ancestors and down to claimants. Meaning of "in equal degree". History of law on this subject. *Thomas v. Marriott*, 154 Md. 108.

To first note to this section, page 2916, vol. 2, of Code, add "(decided prior to act 1912, ch. 91, and 1916, ch. 224)".

Cited but not construed in *Brannan v. Ely*, 157 Md. 103.

140.

To second note to this section, page 2917, vol. 2, of Code, add: And see *Thomas v. Marriott*, 154 Md. 114.

See notes to sec. 135.

141.

To note to this section, page 2918, vol. 2, of Code, add: And see *Thomas v. Marriott*, 154 Md. 114.

144.

Cited but not construed in *Mullen v. Moore*, 156 Md. 422; *Young v. Murray*, 159 Md. 558; *Murray v. Hurst*, 163 Md. 489.

148.

This section referred to in deciding that under a District of Columbia statute the settlement of an administrator's account, which stated the manner of distribution of the residue of the estate, was not *res judicata* of distributee's rights. *Claudy v. Duvall*, 5 F. (2nd), (Ct. Apps., D. C.), 384.

At hearing under this section, where court decided in favor of one group of claimants on the ground of greater intrinsic weight of testimony, held that